

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SAMUEL ARTHUR SABET,

Plaintiff,

-against-

S.D.N.Y.; CHIEF JUDGE LAURA TAYLOR
SWAIN,

Defendants.

22-CV-7842 (ALC)

ORDER OF DISMISSAL
UNDER 28 U.S.C. § 1651

ANDREW L. CARTER, United States District Judge:


On January 31, 2008, the court barred Plaintiff from filing any new civil actions *in forma pauperis* (IFP) without first obtaining from the court leave to file. *See S.A. Godowner v. Footlocker, Inc.*, ECF 1:07-CV-11042, 6 (KMW) (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2008), *appeal dismissed*, No. 08-1068-cv (2d Cir. May 29, 2008) (holding that the appeal “lack[ed] an arguable basis in law or fact.”).¹

Plaintiff files this new *pro se* action and seeks IFP status, but has not sought leave from the court to file. The Court therefore dismisses this action without prejudice for failure to comply with the January 31, 2008, order.

The Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that any appeal from this order would not be taken in good faith, and therefore IFP status is denied for the purpose of an appeal. *See Coppedge v. United States*, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 14, 2022
New York, New York



ANDREW L. CARTER, JR.
United States District Judge

¹ In *S.A. Godowner*, No. 07-CV-11042, Plaintiff sued Footlocker, Inc., under the name “S.A. Godowner.” Plaintiff previously sued Footlocker, Inc. under the names Sabet and Godowner. *See Sabet v. Doe, Owner of Wordmark “Footlocker Inc.”*, No. 07-CV-5882 (DAB) (S.D.N.Y. June 21, 2007) (dismissed for failure to state a claim on which relief may be granted); *Godowner v. Footlocker, Inc.*, No. 08-CV-0338 (KMW) (S.D.N.Y. Jan 15, 2008) (voluntarily withdrawn).